

l: Karsten--10-13
116, 114

(1916-18) 1935
(1928-29)

Jivaro

"A few words may be said as to previous publications which treat of the customs of the Jibaro Indians. The Catholic missionaries who in former times had dealings with these savages have given no information whatever about their customs and beliefs. It is only from the last century that we have some information of this kind, but since the men who visited them were only passing travellers --geographical explorers or business men--the data given by them have naturally been founded on very superficial observation and mainly concern the material culture of these savages. The famous custom of the Jibaros of preparing trophies of the heads of their slain enemies has of course attracted the attention of many travellers, and such a trophy is now to be found in most ethnographic museums in Europe and America. But the ideas underlying this custom and the complicated rites and ceremonies with which the capture of a head is celebrated had never been really described and explained until I published my detailed account of the wars and victory feasts of the Jibaros, mentioned below. This monograph, revised and enlarged in certain points, is incorporated in this work. Among publications from [11] the 19th and the beginning of this century in which the culture of the Jibaro Indians is touched upon or some information is given about them the following may be mentioned: -- Osculati, Esplorazione delle regioni equatoriali (Milano, 1854); Villavicencio, Geografia de la Republica del Ecuador (New York, 1858); Bollaert, 'The

1: Karsten--10-13
116, 114

(1916-18) 1935
(1928-29)

Jivaro-2

Jivaro Indians of Ecuador', in Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London, New Series, Vol. II, pp. 112-118 (London, 1863); Gonzalez Suarez, Estudio Historico sobre los Cañaris (Quito, 1878); Reiss, 'Ein Besuch bei den Jivaros-Indianern', in Verhandlungen der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde, Berlin, Bd. VII, pp. 325-337 (Berlin, 1880); Ordinaire, Les sauvages du Perou (Revue d'Ethnographie. T. VI. Paris, 1887); E. Vacas Galindo, Nankijukima; religion, usos y costumbres de los salvajes del Oriente del Ecuador (Ambato, 1895); F. Gonzalez Suarez, Historia general de la republica del Ecuador, Vol. VI (Quito, 1903); Figueroa, Relación de las misiones de la Compañia de Jesus en el pais de los Maynas (Madrid, 1904); v. Hassel, 'Las tribus salvajes de la region amazonica del Peru' (Boletin de la Sociedad Geografica de Lima, Vol. XVII, Lima, 1905) Rivet, Les indiens Jibaros (L'Anthropologie, Vols. XVIII and XIX, Paris, 1907, 1908).

The information we gather from most of these works is not only very scanty but-- what is still worse--to a great extent untrustworthy. Of general accounts founded on first hand observation, that of v. Hassel seems to me to be the most important, although it only refers to the tribes of the lower Pastaza and the Aguarunas of Peru. Gonzalez Suarez, the Archbishop of Quito, although he never visited the Jibaros in their own land, gives, in his historical work, valuable information concerning the history of these Indians and describes their head-hunting practices as far as they

were known when he wrote. On the other hand, Vacas Galindo's Nankijukima is a novel and worthless as an ethnological source. It is written by a Dominican monk who lived for some years at the village of Macas in the immediate neighbourhood of the Jibaros and certainly had good opportunities of studying the customs of the natives. But it is evidently never meant to give a true account of the culture of the Jibaros, and the errors in the details are in any case sufficiently numerous to deprive it of every scientific value. Besides this, the author's view of the social morality and religion of the Indians is obviously influenced by theological prejudice.

Rivet's monograph on the Jibaro Indians is only a compilation based on the untrustworthy writings of travellers and missionaries who at [12] different times have lived amongst them. Rivet never himself visited these savages in their own land and never saw any other Indians of this tribe than two individuals, who happened to come to the town of Riobamba in central Ecuador while Rivet was there. A few observations, made by Rivet relating to the physical anthropology of these two individuals have, of course, little importance from a scientific point of view as far as the whole tribe is concerned. Similarly, it is difficult to understand on what ground Rivet claims, for instance, to have been able to indicate 'almost exactly', the dwelling-places of the different Jibaro tribes, or considers himself entitled to assert categorically that the Jibaros in all

l: Karsten--10-13
116, 114

(1916-18) 1935
(1928-29)

Jivaro-4

reckon 'no less than 20,000 individuals'. (1) If the real dwelling-places and the total number of the Jibaros can only be ascertained with difficulty even by one who like myself has roamed through the Jibaro country in all directions, this must clearly be impossible to one who has not visited these inaccessible regions at all. Taken as a whole Rivet's book is useless as a source concerning the Jibaros. This particularly holds true of the part dealing with their intellectual culture, which to a great extent is based on Vacas Galindo's novel, just characterized by me. But even the first part of it, dealing with the material culture of these Indians, is greatly wanting in exactness.

During the last ten years a couple of works have appeared in which the Jibaros are dealt with. Thus, in W. C. Farabee's Indian Tribes of Eastern Peru (1922) a chapter is devoted to this important Indian tribe. In the beginning of his article Farabee himself says: 'I was unable to visit the Jibaros in their own country to make personal observations, but was fortunate to find at Iquitos, Peru, Sr. F. T. Muniz, who lived and travelled for some years among this people, and who gave me much information regarding them.' 'Sr. Muniz' is probably a rubber merchant of the type well known

"1. Rivet, Travaux scientifiques de P. Rivet, Paris, 1927."

to every traveller in the interior of tropical South America. How reliable such men generally are as informants on Indian custom, one can easily imagine even without knowing it from personal experience. Whereas Farabee's chapter on the Jibaros does not contain a single new fact on these Indians, it is on the other hand impaired by several serious errors which makes its scientific value more than doubtful. Thus when Farabee states (p. 122) that 'some tribes preserve the heads of their friends as well as those of their enemies, but women's heads are never preserved', this one sentence contains two [13] grave errors. First, the transformation of a human head into a tsantsa implies a deadly insult not only to the dead man himself but also to his whole tribe, and the Jibaros consequently apply that method exclusively to mortal enemies in other tribes. Secondly, it may be deplorable, but is still an indisputable fact that the Jibaros frequently prepared trophies of women's heads also.

As to the Jibaro myths with which Farabee's chapter ends, it may be proper to point out that they do not proceed from Sr. Muniz, but are direct English translations from my own treatise Mitos de los indios Jibaros (Boletin de la Sociedad Ecuatoriana de Estudios Historicos Americanos, Vol. II. Quito, 1919), a source not mentioned in Farabee's chapter.

F. W. Up de Graff's book Bei den Kopfjägern des Amazonas (Leipzig, 1924), although only a popular book of travels written by a merchant, is of interest in so far

1: Karsten--10-13

116, 114

(1916-18) 1935

(1928-29)

Jivaro-6

as its author, according to his own assertion, had an opportunity to watch the behaviour of the Indians when they were on the war-path. Although it seems to me doubtful whether the author has really seen with his own eyes everything that he tells about, there is still substantial agreement between his statements as to the savage lust of murder displayed by the Indians on these occasions and the minute descriptions which I have myself received from Indian chiefs who had taken part in war expeditions. For my own part I did not see how the Jibaros behave in the battle, but instead of that I had the advantage of being present at their great victory feasts. (1)"

"1. As to other similar popular books, G. M. Dyott has, in his On the Trail of the Unknown (London, 1926), in two chapters dealt with the culture of the Jibaro Indians. I deem it necessary, however, [sic] to point out that the data given by Dyott as to certain religious ideas and other customs of the Jibaros are directly taken from my Blood-Revenge, War, and Victory Feasts of the Jibaro Indians--without the source being mentioned. In a few cases, however, Dyott tries to go his own way, making erroneous statements which show how little he knows the Jibaro culture.--On a much higher level as a popular book of travels is K. G. Grubb's Amazon and Andes (London, 1930), where the Jibaro Indians (Aguarunas) are also shortly but correctly treated of."

"The small grammar [sic] and vocabulary published by me in Spanish in 1921 under the title La Lengua de los Indios Jibaros may be regarded as the first real account of the language of these Indians. I am of course aware that as early as 1909 and 1910 a short study of it had been published by H. Beuchat and P. Rivet in the Anthropos(1). But neither of the authors had any personal knowledge of it; their study is wholly founded on sources of secondary importance, namely the short and untrustworthy vocabularies noted down by passing travellers who have visited the Jibaros at different times. Even the vocabularies made by the Catholic Fathers appear to be greatly lacking in exactness. Thus the very name given the Jibaros by Beuchat and Rivet Šiwōra (Shiwōra) is erroneous. The name by which all Jibaro tribes call themselves is Shu'ra. Now it is a well-known fact that there are different dialects of the language, and the authors mentioned also distinguish such dialects. But the sources of their information were most unreliable as appears from the vocabulary. In that vocabulary the dialect of Macas is best represented. But the informants of those who have originally written down the words have evidently not been the Indians inhabiting that [540] region, that is, the Jibaros of the Upano, but the mestizos of Macas. Many of these speak the Jibaro

"1. Beuchat et Rivet, 'La langue Jibaro ou Šiwora', in Anthropos, tom. IV (1909) and tom. V (1910)."

l: Karsten--539-541
116, 114

(1916-18) 1935
(1928-29)

Jivaro-2

language fairly well, but one peculiarity characteristic of them is that they lengthen many Jibaro words with a syllable which is made to begin with an l, although this letter does not exist in the language at all, thus distorting the words. Both in Rivet's monograph on the Jibaros and in Beuchat's and Rivet's article on the Jibaro language accordingly we find words like tunduli instead of tundúi (the big drum), súla instead of sua (Genipa americana), hēla instead of hēa, 'house', pingullu instead of pingúi (flute) huambulushi instead of huambuishi (the silk cotton), all erroneous forms of the words quite commonly used at Macas. Other errors also abound throughout in the vocabulary, but space makes it impossible for me to call attention to them. These errors are in a way quite natural. No one can satisfactorily write on a language which he does not know, without having reliable material at his disposal.

It may be proper in this connection to emphasize that it is by no means so easy as has generally been assumed to note down a vocabulary of the language of a savage tribe. The opinion that almost any passing traveller, who chances to come into contact with members of a tribe, is able to make a vocabulary of its language, good enough to serve as a basis for comparative linguistic studies, is founded in error. My own impression at any rate is that most of the incomplete vocabularies and notes of Indian languages which have been made, in former times as in our own days, by such untrained and superficial observers in different parts of South America are useless from a scientific

point of view and that a doubtful service is done to comparative linguistics [sic] by their publication. Even missionaries and other persons who have perhaps stayed for years among the same people, have often lacked that phonetic ear necessary for the purpose of apprehending the strange words and writing them down correctly. A special aptitude and training for this sort of study is, I think, also necessary.

Another little-known grammar [sic] and vocabulary of the Jibaro language was published privately in Ecuador in 1928 by Father Salvador Daroni of the Salesian Order, under the title Diccionario de bolsillo del idioma Jibaro. The vocabulary is comparatively copious and its author evidently possessed some practical knowledge of the language. It contains however numerous errors, and besides this, the transcription will render the pronunciation of many words difficult for an English reader. A curious mistake appearing in this as well as in Beuchat's and Rivet's grammar [sic] [541] on the Jibaro language is that as the particular characteristic of the infinitive the suffix tasen is regularly given which is said to be, in itself, the auxiliary verb 'to be'. I do not know whether such an infinitive termination exists in the Quilapisa dialect, spoken by the now half-civilized Jibaro Indians living near the town Cuenca, almost the only Jibaro dialect of which I have no knowledge. Father Daroni does not indicate which particular tribe speaks the language recorded by him; he simply speaks of the 'Jibaro language'. I have therefore to remark that none of the Jibaro tribes whom I know have

1: Karsten--539-541

116, 114

(1916-18) 1935

(1928-29)

Jivaro-4

an infinitive ending with the suffix tázan. The suffix which is specially characteristic of the infinitive is tinyu, in itself an infinitive form of the auxiliary tihei, 'I am'."

8: Dickey--201 [2]

116, 152, 114

(1936) 1936

Jivaro

"The tribes...are referred to, in the writings of certain intrepid explorers, as Head Hunters. The usual picture is that of a sinister, bloodthirsty tribe, who as an outdoor sport dash off into the woods, grabbing innocent Indians whose heads they remove and shrink, with all the manifestations of ghoulish glee. And all this without rhyme or reason.

The Jivaros--and I must use this name with which they've been baptized--are neither sinister nor bloodthirsty. I base this conclusion on a relationship with them of nearly nineteen years' duration. On the contrary, they are hospitable and humble."

12: Rivet--348-349
116, 175, 114

(no date) 1907

Jívaro

Such is the present state of things: need I add that all these efforts hardly produced any serious results and that the conversion of the Jibaro is not begun? However, thanks to these missions we know a great many interesting details [349] about these savages so stubbornly resistant to all civilized influences. On the other hand, the numerous explorers who have penetrated these unknown regions in the second half of the 19th century have brought back ample harvests of ethnological and geographical documents. These accounts of missionaries and explorers have attracted the attention of ethnologists to the Jibaros and these ethnologists have devoted some more or less important articles to them. Here I will only mention Hamy's memoir. To this author goes the honor of having first coordinated the scattered accounts relative to these curious Indians, given a complete study of mummified heads, and discussed the important problem of the origin of this great tribe (1).

1. E. -T. -Hamy. Decades Americanae. Memoires d'archéologie et d'ethnographie américaines, 3rd and 4th Decades, p. 43. "Nouveaux renseignements sur les Indiens Jivaros" (article published in the Revue d'Anthropologie, vol. II, July 1873, p. 385.)

"The Jívaro have probably received more attention than any other South American tribe; the scientific literature on them is enormous. Nevertheless, many aspects of Jívaro culture are imperfectly known.

Old missionary and explorers' accounts contain only fragments of information. (See p. 511 and Stirling, 1938, for a bibliography of these.) Ethnological studies tend to treat only limited aspects of the culture or to reflect strong theoretical views of the authors. Karstne's many publications, which are summarized in his comprehensive work (1935), were based on 3 years of field work, though he only twice spent more than 8 days in a single village. His theoretical interest in religion is very manifest, and it is frequently impossible to distinguish his own or his informant's views from his first-hand observations. Nonetheless, it is the main source on social and religious culture. Rivet's studies are compilations of older sources; he never visited the Jívaro. Up de Graf's (1923) work is designed for popular appeal. Tessmann (1930) adds only a few fragments of information from an Aguaruna informant. Stirling (1938) is the first to recognize the informant. Stirling (1938) is the first to recognize the importance of change in the historic period; he also adds new detailed data on blowguns, preparation of shrunken heads, shamanism, weaving, and warfare.

Present needs include adequate studies of technology (which are now only partially available), clarification of social structure and function and of marriage practice through

a genealogical approach, verification of the patterns of religion and shamanism, analysis of property rights, and study of agricultural methods. There is also abundant opportunity for investigation of local variations in this large and widely distributed tribe."

23: Turner--58 [2]

(No date) 1944

Jivaro

116, 114, 727

"Since the foregoing was sent to press, [KS: Counterfeit 'Tsantsas' in the Pitt Rivers Museum] Mr. Stirling has drawn my attention to a journalist's account of a domestic workshop on the outskirts of Quito where 'shrunk heads' are made in quantity from goat- and dog-skin shaped over clay moulds and shaved in the appropriate places. One diagnostic feature of these counterfeits is that the hairs of both eyebrows necessarily run in the same direction. (Ludwig Bemelmans, 'The Head-Hunters of the Quito Hills.' The New Yorker, April 12, 1941. New York.)"

'Ethnographic literature: Of all the tribes of Eastern Peru the Chiwaros are most frequently discussed in ethnographic literature. With the exception of the Uitotos there is no other tribe about which so many monographic studies--at least concerning certain aspects--have been written as in the case of the Chiwaros. To the Finnish scholar Rafael Karsten must go the credit for having written scientifically sound descriptions of the Chiwaro culture. The following list of publications [KS: See category 113] does not claim to be complete. I have omitted the rich literature concerning the mummified heads and the notes published by various museums. A chronologically arranged survey of this type of literature may be found in L'Anthropologie, XIX, p. 74 (author: Rivet). I have included only a few recent notes on this subject. I did not include the article by Milacsek (Buenos Aires), published in 'Erdball' (1927), p. 372, since this article is not based upon a knowledge of the Chiwaros, though Milacsek pretends that he had visited the tribe. The book written by the Princess Theresa of Bavaria, Reisestudien im westlichen Südamerika (Berlin, 1908), vol. I, p. 271 contains at least a few good pictures; otherwise the book does not contain any personal observations concerning the Chiwaros.

In our preceding number we published an article by Felice Vité, member of the Italian Expedition to the Amazon, on the Jíbaro Indians of Ecuador and on their "Tchantchas", mummified heads reduced to a tenth their natural size. In the "Revista Municipal" of Guayaquil, we now find an article by the Director of the Museum of that city, Dr. Modesto Chávez Franco, on this same subject; it is preceded by a note from the editorial staff explaining that it is reproduced from the number of August 11, 1927; in view of the interest it had aroused that number was out of print and insistent requests had been made for its reprint.

As the article published by this Revista also appears to have awakened great curiosity, we believe it opportune to reproduce the report of the Director of the Museo de Guayaquil, with the exception of paragraphs which refer to the process of mummification used by the Jíbaros which are more or less similar to the account given in our Revista. We note that Dr. Chávez Franco adopts the orthography "Tshantshas", rather than the spelling we have preferred, believing it to be better adapted to the phonetic of the word.

Jivaro Souls

MICHAEL J. HARNER

University of California, Berkeley

101
[181] THE Jivaro proper (*matsari tsarot*) of eastern Ecuador have long been famous for their warlike practices,¹ but the assumptions about reality upon which they predicate such behavior have not been systematically studied and analyzed.² A very important series of these assumptions is to be found in the Jivaro ideas concerning souls. Among these concepts has recently been discovered a deep-seated belief that killing leads to the acquisition of souls which provide a supernatural power conferring immunity from death. The purpose of the present paper is to outline some of the basic elements of these beliefs with the hope of providing a greater insight into Jivaro behavior.³

128 The emphasis here will be on presenting new data collected in 1956-57,⁴ but the concluding paragraphs of the paper embody a commentary on relevant statements in the major publications dealing with this subject. At the outset it should be mentioned that I took the two most useful works on the Jivaro (Karsten 1935; Stirling 1938) into the field and went over them in detail with native informants. Accordingly, points of difference between the following material and that given by Karsten and Stirling should definitely be taken by the reader to indicate modification or refutation of the previously published statements, at least in regard to the Jivaro proper.⁵

114 Field research providing the present data was conducted for ten and a half months in the following river valleys occupied by the Jivaro: the Rio Upano and its tributaries, the Rio Tutanangoza and the Rio Sepa; the Rio Chiguaza; the Rio Macuma; the Rio Cangaimi; the Rio Cacuimi; the Rio Mangosiza; and in a refugee Jivaro settlement near Bucay on the western slope of the Andes. Informants who contributed particularly to the information embodied in the present paper were: *MubwimpU*, *TashimpU*, *Utill*, *Aba'a*, *Kugull*, and *U'ala Aba'a* of the Rio Tutanangoza; *Mala* of the upper Rio Macuma; and *Hintal* of the Rio Cangaimi. Chief interpreters were *HwoyA*, *Tupi*, and *Noita*, all from the Rio Tutanangoza region.

124 The best information on supernatural concepts was obtained in intensive eight or nine hour daily interviews with single informants over periods of a few days to several weeks. This was an exhausting procedure for all involved: interviewer, interpreter, and informant, but was conducive to the elicitation of truthful detail. Informants' accounts were continually cross-checked and contradictions called to their attention individually. An informant, when thus confronted with a contradiction, and with his reputation for knowledge and veracity at stake, generally provided elaborative supporting detail which he might not have otherwise volunteered.

258
A full explanation of footnotes, see category 116, PP 270-272
-- Analysis?

208

Amazon Anthropologist

[64, 1962]

774
183

The *arutam* and belief system contains a number of significant supernatural traits organized together into one internally logical complex. In this system the central idea of immunity from death is combined with such anthropologically well-known concepts as: a vision quest; a guardian spirit; internal and multiple souls; a variety of generalized ancestor worship; exorcism; soul-loss; soul-capture; non-dramatistic spirit possession; and a concept of personally acquired impersonal power, *kakarna*, which resembles, but is not peculiarly identical to, the Christian *mana*.

774
182
181

The concept of the *maiak* furnishes the rationale for head-taking and drinking, as well as explaining or supernaturalizing those deaths which in many other cultures would be ascribed to accidental causes. In conclusion, one may observe that the Jivaro are so preoccupied with killing in real life that it seems only consistent that their two most emphasized types of souls, the *maiak* and the *arutam* soul, are supernatural devices, respectively, for murdering and avoiding being murdered. Beyond this, it is clear that these internally coherent and complex bodies of belief are an important part of the Jivaro view of reality and, as such, affect their overt behavior.

A COMMENTARY ON PRITCHARD'S REPORTS

128

A few brief comments seem to be due the reader to clarify the differences between the statements presented here and those of Karsten and Stirling, the chief contributors to the literature on the Jivaro people. The souls will be considered here in the same order as in the preceding body of the paper, with the *arutam* and first.

114
182
181

The "*arutam*" dealt with here is the "*arutoma*" of Karsten (1933:408, 51) and the "*arutoma*" of Stirling (1938:115, 116). Karsten's term is a corruption of "*arutam*," found in a trade language used between the Jivaro and the Ecuadorian mestizo living in the village of Macos. As Karsten (1954:25) has already pointed out, Stirling's term does not exist in the Jivaro dialect.

192

Karsten (1954:25) has stated, "The word *aruta* or *arutam* in the Jivaro language means 'old'; as a religious term *arutoma* may be translated into 'The old ones' . . ." Actually, however, while both words do have the same root, and *aruta* does indeed mean "old" or "used," the term "*arutam*" refers exclusively to the special vision which I have termed "vision quest." My informant assured me that it does not mean "old men." Also an *arutam*, however frightening it may appear, never kills anyone, despite a statement to the contrary by Karsten (1933:490). Although Karsten (1933:448-50) had come of the vision described to him, he was unaware of the soul responsible for them and the related system of belief.

193

191

While Stirling (1938:115) recognizes a similarity between his "*arutoma*" (*arutam*) and concepts of the same type in other cultures, he is misleading in stating that "*arutoma*" is the same itself or that "it gives supernatural properties to certain classes of animals, plants or natural phenomena." When an *arutam* appears to a Jivaro, it is actually recognized to be a vision, distinct from NATURAL forms OF LIFE OR OTHER NATURAL PHENOMENA.

11-10-1942

Dixon Dixon

200

from natural forces of life or other natural phenomena... Goring (1910: 116) gives
 even in stating that "All of the principal native gods... contain powerful
 elements." In fact, it is highly questionable whether there are any super-
 natural figures whom the Jivaro could be said to view as gods. Goring's
 candidates for gods are primarily "Pachai, the Right God," and "Papi,
 the great ancestral River God." Any such figures are but part of the superstitious
 of the Jivaro people. Kroeber (1911: 10) has already taken note of this
 situation, saying, "But the Jivaro have no belief in a personal Supreme
 Being." Actually, pachai is the correct name and refers to a plant which the
 Jivaro use magically to cause rain to wash the rivers so that their trading
 routes are unobstructed. But it is not a god. The actual supernatural role of
 "Papi" (papi) is not significantly greater than has been indicated in the
 preceding descriptions of the customs and magical rites. Kroeber (1911: 10) is
 also correct in regarding a claim for a Jivaro deity, named "Kachikachai," as
 forward and Morris (1911: 11), a claim simply stating that a great
 statement by an early traveler in the Jivaro country. While on the subject of
 supposed Jivaro gods, it might as well be mentioned that Kroeber (1911: 11)
 his candidate for an "Earth mother" goddess really refers to a class of female
 spirits (leopards) which are probably to be best defined as "trap bait." The
 really, they are but a kind of spirit, despite such a claim by Kroeber (1911: 11).

In regard to the magical, Kroeber (1911: 10) was aware of the potentially
 beneficial nature of the spirit of a slain enemy, but does not report some of the
 major beliefs surrounding it, nor is he apparently cognizant of the fact that the
 surviving spirit while it resides in the totemic. He (1911: 10) is wrong when he
 states that the dark shagreened head is not called "Kachai." Nor can I agree
 with him when he says (1911: 10): "... I have indicated the real purpose of
 the totemic, and in my statements, founded on personal observation and some
 careful inquiry, there is nothing to add and nothing to correct."

Goring then not mention an avenging soul or spirit. While he notes
 (1911: 76) that the totemic possesses magical power, he incorrectly identifies
 such power as "sorcery," when it is really power emanating from the
 totem.

Kroeber fails to distinguish the white totem and thus, even to name the
 totem which alone, it is difficult to tell often to which apply in the preceding
 text. He is definitely wrong in his statement (1911: 112) that "... gen-
 erally, totemic and totemic objects... seem to be considered simply as domes-
 ticated human souls." What is fact is that no plants or totemic objects are
 believed to be souls (although a few specific plants have souls and only a few
 animals (e.g., deer, wolf) are believed to be such. All other totemic objects
 are thought to have some kind of soul and Goring never mentions such.

To the reader who wonders whether some of the conflicts are due to
 culture change during the intervals between fieldwork by the different in-
 vestigators, I submit the fact that several of my most important informants
 were already existing families prior to Kroeber's initial Jivaro fieldwork in

[Ruben]

Stone Tools

271

194

- a. English is to say (followed by a hard g sound when not the terminal phoneme)
- c. Spanish g (which like English k when following a nasal consonant, followed when pre-
ceding k, palatalized when following t or l plus a nasal consonant)
- d. Spanish s
- e. Spanish z
- f. English sh
- g. English is to say
- h. Spanish r (which like Spanish d when following a nasal consonant, palatalized when follow-
ing t or l plus a nasal consonant)
- i. English a (which like the English e when adjacent to i)
- j. Spanish e

Contextual remarks (intended to illustrate a) follow) are capitalized. There is no the pronunciation
of the words unless otherwise noted. It also indicates transliteration.

* It is more detailed pronunciation is provided for Jivaro, Jivaro, Jivaro, Jivaro.

121

* The following was sponsored primarily by the Henry L. and Grace Tinker Foundation,
with supplementary grants provided by the Department of Anthropology and the Museum of
Anthropology of the University of California, Berkeley, by the American Museum of Natural
History, and by the American Anthropological Association (S&P contract grant). John H. Rowe
of the University of California contributed greatly to the understanding of the Jivaro through
his encouragement and advice.

* I wish to acknowledge my debt to those two previous fieldworkers. Their material pro-
vided immeasurable leads for investigation and made my own research much more productive
than it otherwise would have been.

* Another may also be processed of another, about the first word and consonant are less
changeable, as is the case with many Jivaro words. See Turner (1956) for a discussion of this and
other Jivaro linguistic aspects of Jivaro.

* Jivaro talk is the evidence of another such is so strong that all persons interviewed in the
country, even at distances equal to several hundred miles in the Rio Tigris valley, represent a
complete variation in their words.

* One of the members of the party was struck on the side of the head (Peters, op.) instead of
the other side. Usually this is a person who has never seen another and therefore takes the drug to
control the reaction of another. The other members of the group always have medicine in order to
be able to intervene and prevent the defense person under its influence.

* The reaction is the initial action which only results directly when reaction.

* Jivaro who have seen another can be surprisingly well adapted to this task alone.

* There is also a very good reason, among, where and is not so easily controlled and does not
leave the body of its presence when such reflections are made.

* The action and reaction in the body of a person is not the same and is not permanent even,
but only the end of some process from during these comparisons.

* Jivaro in the Jivaro are usually impressed by the new shooting which requires comparison
between Jivaro of different knowledge and capabilities. The functional basis for the
reaction can be seen in the state of the individual in which the reaction process by being caused
a speech and gesture.

* Should any be alternately processed another.

* When a man does not cut off the head of a person he has captured (i.e., when the victim
talking in the air itself, he runs the victim here down at the ground so that the victim's mouth
is kept in it emerging through the mouth. Thus the members began to mark some before the
emerging head on each line.

* A rather extraordinary amount of information has been published regarding the Jivaro,
concerning the reaction. I wish to emphasize that any information concerning the information
presented here and previous accounts reflects ignorance of that material.

* The Jivaro practice drilling cultivation and move their lower locations along with their
grains.

128

[22]

127

174

[44]

[183]

[184]

[196]

[188]

[198]

[196]

226

223

221

222

214

215

214

214

215

215

215

215

275
825
114
127
171

¹¹ Possibly this is due to the fact that the old clearings provide feeding grounds for these animals.

¹² Thanks are particularly due to Mildred Larson and David Beasley of the Summer Institute of Linguistics for providing information regarding the Aguaruna and Huambisa beliefs, respectively. I briefly interviewed several Huambisa and Aguaruna men on these points at the Institute's base in Yarinacocha, eastern Peru, in January 1961, and questioned an Achuar informant on the same subject in 1957 near the Río Cangaimo, eastern Ecuador.

REFERENCES CITED

- 113 KARSTEN, RAFAEL
1935 The head hunters of western Amazonas; the life and culture of the Jivaro Indians of eastern Ecuador and Peru. *Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum*, vol. 7, no. 1. Helsinki.
1954 Some critical remarks on ethnological field research in South America. *Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum*, vol. 19, no. 5. Helsinki.
- STEWART, JULIAN H. and ALFRED METRAUX
1948 Tribes of the Peruvian and Ecuadorian Montaña. In *Handbook of South American Indians*, vol. 3, Julian H. Stewart, ed. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 143. Washington.
- STIRLING, M. W.
1938 Historical and ethnographical material on the Jivaro Indians. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 117. Washington.
- TURNER, GLEN D.
1958 Alternative phonemicizing in Jivaro. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 24:87-94.

/326 cont. /

175

177

Only rarely have the Jívaros been visited by scholarly travelers, so our knowledge of this tribe is based chiefly on Spanish reports. The most competent expert is probably Spruce, who lived for a long time in their region and penetrated farther than most other travelers. In the case of a people so little known, I may dare to hope that the observations of a traveler whose studies were somewhat remote from ethnology will be of some interest despite their inadequacy and will secure me the indulgence of the honored assembly for the following remarks.

400

/327/

The bulk of the population of the republic of Ecuador lives in the high mountains of the Cordillera in the part of the range designated in Spanish America as tierra fría. Bleak and bare, the inhabited part of the highlands, in which most of the towns are located at a height between about 2,200 and 3,000 meters, is easily accessible for civilization. Rough, high mountain chains surround this not very productive land, whereas dense, immeasurable forests cover the eastern and western slopes of the Cordillera. To the west there is contact with the coast and the provinces found there, but a visit to the few settlements located on the eastern slope of the principal mountain chain has always been considered a difficult and daring undertaking. The dreaded East Cordillera must be crossed on the worst routes, and then there is a long march full of hardships through the forest, during which large rivers have to be crossed, the flooding of which often exposes the travelers to death from hunger. Mâcas is probably the easiest of all these places to reach, since a quite considerable part of the way is passable by mule.

133

Riobamba, the capital of the Provincia del Chimborazo, is the point of departure for the journey. One follows upstream the Rio Chambo, coming from the south, which in its upper parts is called Rio de Cebadas and Rio Colay. The river, originating near the ridge of the East Cordillera, joins at the foot of the Tunguragua the Rio de Patate coming from the north, from Cotopaxi, and then, turning eastward, breaks through the Cordillera and flows

/329 cont./

132 the ice-cold wind, often driving hail and snow in front of it.

136 Exhausted by the many vain attempts, they meet their death in the lake, piling up on its shores.

132 I crossed this pass in the best season, in the month of December, but even then the Indians accompanying me, in

● 114 spite of the fact that all had been accustomed to mountain climbing for a long time, suffered from the penetrating cold and wetness.

133 One has hardly reached the end of the swampy highland valley and climbed the low ridge to the side of the Cocha redonda when the whole scene changes abruptly. One stands at the edge of a steep cliff, over whose wall a brook flowing from the above-mentioned Cocha falls in a high waterfall, a deep gorge filled with dark-green forest lies at our feet, and stunted trees go up as far as the edge of the pass. One imagines the spicy air and mild temperature of the warm country and feels invigorated; even the Indian, already dejected and stiff with cold, takes fresh courage at the sight of the montaña, the land of wondrous fertility. One descends steeply in zigzags along the cliff wall, the waterfalls are crossed several times, until the first valley floor is reached. The vegetation becomes more luxuriant with every step; we find ourselves in the zone which Pöppig portrayed so excellently in his description of the Ceja. We found Sunag (2,688 meters), a small village consisting of 15-20 wooden huts and a chapel, deserted; all the inhabitants had gone farther down the valley to harvest maize at Chanala (2,470 meters), Chillan, Puentehondo. The six or seven houses which make up the village of Paira (1,617 meters) lie two short days of travel farther down in the valley. The foot of the steep mountains has been reached here; only elongated hills continue to the east. The rivers, still rapid, to be sure, become broad and even navigable for short stretches; 491 an immense forest area stretches out before one's eyes. Up to here we found the brooks, which were difficult to cross, bridged over, although the liana bridges, serving as a model for our suspension bridges, sometimes offered crossings which appeared

INTRODUCTION

Only one tribe of American Indians is known ever to have successfully revolted against the empire of Spain and to have thwarted all subsequent attempts by the Spaniards to reconquer them: the Jivaro (hee'-va-ro), the *untswi harrä* of eastern Ecuador. From 1599 onward they remained unconquered in their forest fastness east of the Andes, despite the fact that they were known to occupy one of the richest placer gold deposit regions in all of South America.

Tales of their fierceness became part of the folklore of Latin America, and their warlike reputation spread in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when Jivaro "shrunk head" trophies, *tsamtsia*, found their way to the markets of exotica in the Western world. As occasional travelers visited them in the first decades of this century, the Jivaro also became known not as just a warlike group, but as an individualistic people intensely jealous of their freedom and unwilling to be subservient to authority, even among themselves. It was this quality that particularly attracted me when I went to study their way of life in 1956-57 and I was most fortunate, at that time, to find, especially east of the Cordillera de Cutucú, a portion of the Jivaro still unconquered and still living, with some changes, their traditional life style. This book is about their culture.

A factor that contributed to my decision to do fieldwork among the Jivaro was the incredible volume of contradictory and often obviously unreliable information on their culture.

- 114 There was certainly no other tribe in South America about
121 which less was known in proportion to what had been published. Part of this situation was due to certain aspects of Jivaro culture, particularly the making of *tsantsa*, which lent themselves to sensationalistic articles and popular books which were typically based upon a minimum or even an absence of actual contact with the Jivaro. Only two serious major works on them existed: the late Rafael Karsten's *Head-hunters of Western Amazonas* (1935), and M. W. Stirling's *Historical and Ethnographical Material on the Jivaro Indians* (1938). Yet much of what Karsten wrote was vague and highly opinionated, and Stirling's field data were fairly limited due to the short time he spent with the Jivaro. In addition, where the two authors overlapped in subject matter, their reports tended to be strongly contradictory.¹

In view of this situation, I took both Karsten's and Stirling's works into the field with me and reviewed them sentence by sentence with Jivaro informants. Except for Stirling's data on material culture, I found that there was scarcely a paragraph of ethnographic information in either work that could be considered wholly accurate.

In time, it became evident that the erratic quality of information supplied by both anthropologists derived in part from their reliance on white men as interpreters. Karsten depended almost exclusively on Macabeos, the mestizo inhabitants of the village of Macas, for his communication with Indian informants. He also relied on them for second-hand information on Jivaro culture, as I ascertained by talking to Macabeos who had worked for him. I also found that the Macabeos had misconceptions of Jivaro culture which they believed in so strongly that they were willing to argue with the Indians about the latter's own culture. It was not too different in Stirling's case, although much more expectable,

INTRODUCTION

3

since he was able to spend only a few short months with the Jivaro in comparison with Karsten's intermittent work during several years. Stirling's interpreter was Santiago Baca of Méndez, whom I knew personally, and whom on one occasion I tested as an interpreter. Although a fine person, Baca hardly would let an Indian speak before he reinterpreted and expanded what had been said to fit his own preconceptions. The following portion of a letter from Stirling to me, dated June 30, 1962, in response to an article which I had just published on Jivaro soul beliefs,² shows the role of Baca in his work. I would like to add that I consider the letter a tribute to Stirling's scholarly integrity:

It is high time that adequate studies are finally being made of this significant group. When I made my rather hasty trip through the Jivaro country in 1930-31, the working conditions were far from ideal. The expedition was badly organized and from the standpoint of the ethnologist we were never able to stay in one place long enough to get proper results. I knew nothing of the Jivaro language, and depended entirely on the interpreter-Santiago Baca—for the esoteric information. What I recorded was what he understood from the informants. He was, incidentally, a political refugee and had lived 2 years with the Jivaro in hiding.

It is interesting to note that most of the Jivaro we encountered at that time insisted that they knew nothing of religious beliefs—that we would have to contact old Anguasha (on the Yaupe [Yaupi] River). We finally did contact him, and he was the source of most of this type of material which I secured. I am sure that he was a good informant—very sincere and desirous of being precise—so the errors were probably the result of misunderstanding by the interpreter, since I tried not to fill in any interpretations of my own. I had Karsten's work with me, and after getting our own material I checked with Karsten's accounts. The Indians would agree with practically none of his ideas, in-

- 114 sisting that they had never heard of such a thing. Incidentally, I
- 121 never learned with which group he worked—a fact which he
- appeared to keep secret. I assumed that either the Indians with
- whom he worked had different concepts, or that he possibly sup-
- plied interpretations of his own.

It does not seem probable to me that basic changes in funda-
mental beliefs could take place in 30 years, so I am inclined to
agree with you that the errors in my account were the result
of wrong interpretation.

- 121 Since the purpose of the present book is to provide a broad
- 128 introduction to Jivaro culture rather than a detailed compari-
son with earlier publications, the reader will not find specific
criticisms of Karsten's and Stirling's data in the following
pages. These will be gradually provided in more specialized
publications, which will also have the function of focusing on
particular aspects of Jivaro life in greater detail. To the
specialist who reads this work, however, I wish to say that
statements that he finds here implicitly contradicting those
of the two other authors may be taken, in fact, as explicit
corrections of their accounts. A contradictory account here
does not imply ignorance of their material.

Beyond this, of course, is the question of cultural change.

- [115] First of all, I wish to note that several of my most important
elderly informants were already raising families prior to Kar-
sten's initial Jivaro fieldwork in 1916-18 and did not come
into substantial first-hand contact with whites until fifteen to
- [114] twenty years later. The fieldwork by Stirling occurred later,
in 1930-31, but as Stirling himself noted above, the basic
source of difference with my own material was probably his
interpreter. In addition, I made a special effort to secure field
data that would reveal those aspects of Jivaro culture that had
changed or remained stable during this century, and the final
chapter of the book is devoted to that subject.

INTRODUCTION

7

Fieldwork in the summer of 1964 was carried out under 122
the auspices of the Associates in Tropical Biogeography of the
University of California, Berkeley, and the Robert H. Lowie
Museum of Anthropology of the same institution. Sponsor-
ship of the 1969 summer investigations was by the American
Museum of Natural History, the Columbia University
Council for Research in the Social Sciences, and the Columbia
University Institute of Latin American Studies.

I am particularly indebted to Professor John H. Rowe of 114
the Department of Anthropology of the University of Cali-
fornia, Berkeley, who first called my attention to the inade-
quacies of the published material on the Jivaro and who
supported me in embarking on the initial field research,^a
when others felt that it was too perilous a project. Other
colleagues who have been of particular assistance are Robert
F. Murphy, James J. Parsons, Robert L. Carneiro and Ken-
neth Kensinger. My wife, Sandra, my son, James, and my
daughter, Teresa, have helped make this work possible in
such profound ways that they will probably never fully real-
ize the depth of their contribution.

Ecuadorians and Americans in Ecuador who especially
made possible the success of the fieldwork through their
friendship and assistance were Dr. Alberto Flores González,
Director of the Instituto Ecuatoriano de Antropología y
Geografía, Sr. and Sra. Alfredo Costales Samaniego of the
same institute, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Stuck, Mr. and Mrs.
Michael Ficke, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Drown, Mr. W. Ferguson
and Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Ferguson, and also Dr. Glen
Turner of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, who contrib-
uted linguistic information on the Jivaro language. Dr. Tur-
ner is not to be held responsible, however, for oversimplifi-
cations in the orthography used here.

My greatest debt, and one which I can never adequately 123

- 124 changes, the investigator normally attempted to compare the views of a number of persons regarding modifications in each type of cultural activity. Accordingly, a trend is reported here only if it was substantiated independently by at least several reliable informants. To heighten the accuracy of such information, the trends reported here are further restricted to those which the informants had observed during the passage of their own lifetimes. Changes that had reportedly gone on in the culture previously, and for which the information was therefore of a hearsay type, are not included unless specifically so noted. Thus the reported
- 114 changes primarily occurred during the period ca. 1895-1957. The ethnographic present in this chapter, as elsewhere, is 1956-57.
- 121 It should be pointed out that the material that follows
- 124 often includes consideration of causal factors from the informants' point of view. Such statements of opinion regarding causal relationships between changes are, unless otherwise indicated, those of elderly, knowledgeable informants whom I respected for their intelligence and ability to analyze the events about them. In asking and respecting the opinions of native informants about causality I depart from the position of some anthropologists who have seemed to doubt the ability of non-literate peoples to provide meaningful analysis of causal relationships within their own culture. On the
- 121 contrary, I have found that the Jivaro are extremely aware of,
- 124 and alert to, the factors directly influencing their lives; and
- 151 normally I found their hypotheses superior to those that I
- 181 proposed and tested in the field. Unlike some other non-literate populations, for example the Conibo Indians of eastern Peru, whom I have also studied, the Jivaro almost never explain any behavior, traditional or otherwise, on the basis of such a statement as "we do it that way because our ancestors

EPILOGUE

In the summer of 1969 I revisited the *untsurí tsuará* both east and west of the Cordillera de Cutucú. The changes in Jivaro life that had occurred, even since my last fieldwork in 1964, were far more extensive than anything I could have predicted. Small airstrips, primarily opened up by the missionaries, now dot almost all of the Jivaro region. Under missionary sponsorship, bilingual Jivaro schoolteachers have been placed in the most remote locations, and medical treatment is periodically dispensed along with evangelization.

Ecuadorian army garrisons are now found in the *untsurí tsuará* territory as far east as the Río Pangui, where there is now a major air-supplied military base and Salesian mission (Taisha), as well as a new settlement of more than one hundred white colonists. Missionaries have collaborated with the military and police forces both west and east of the Cutucú range to largely halt intra-tribal assassinations as well as warfare with the Achuara. In recent years, men who have engaged in such traditional raids have often been seized and sent off to an uncertain future in prison in the Ecuadorian highlands. These actions by the modern state have essentially brought interpersonal security to most of the Jivaro, thereby fundamentally altering the nature of the reality upon which much of their socio-economic structure and ideology were built. There are probably few cultures in the history of the world that have been so rapidly and significantly disintegrated by the simple introduction of centralized "law and order."

NOTES

221

000

• [114]

dwell south of the present Ecuadorian border, which prevented the author from visiting them and making a field comparison.

The Achuara, whom the author did visit, are frequently confused with the Jivaro in the literature and also are commonly included in the latter term by Ecuadorians who are not familiar with the distinctions between the two tribes or dialect groups. Salient cultural features that distinguish the Achuara from the Jivaro include the following: permanent matrilocality; weaving is done by the women; the women wear a topless skirt rather than a dress over one shoulder; the men's kilt is predominantly white rather than reddish-brown; two doors are commonly located in the women's end of the house; a stockade may be built outside the house in times of heightened hostilities; at other times houses often have no walls at all. The permanent matrilocality results in household populations considerably in excess of those normally found among the Jivaro, which has contributed to contradictions in the literature by explorers and others who were unaware, in fact, that they were among the Achuara.

[171]

[127]

13. *Cieza de León*, 1943, pp. 295-96; González Suárez, 1890, p. 54. Many of the sources cited by Stirling, 1938, in his compilation of historical materials, are not utilized here because they actually refer to Jivaroan groups other than the Jivaro proper (*tuntsuri suarä*).

14. *Jiménez de la Espada*, 1965, Tomo 4, pp. 174-77.

[231]

[235]

15. It was probably at about this time that the Jivaro initially obtained chickens and pigs. The presence of pigs among the Jivaro is first definitely reported in 1683 by Lucero, 1892, p. 37. However, records are so fragmentary that it seems safe to assume that this report could have followed the actual introduction by a century or longer.

[195]

16. Velasco, 1842, p. 151; Lucero, 1892, p. 33. The present writer is inclined to place Sevilla del Oro on the middle Río Upano (the Sucúa-Huambi area), because significant placer gold deposits do not occur on the upper portion of the river and because early reports of its latitude seem more consistent with such a location.

17. *Jiménez de la Espada*, 1897, p. 45. Translated by the author.

18. Velasco, 1842, p. 153; and n.d., p. 97.

19. Translated by the author from Velasco, 1842, pp. 153-57.

20. Lucero, 1892, p. 34.

21. Accounts of one of these ill-fated attempts may be found in Velasco, n.d., pp. 10-7; 203; 209-10; 286-288; and in Velasco, 1842, pp. 158-60.

22. *Jiménez de la Espada*, 1897, pp. 43-44.

23. Macabeos oral histories. Cf. also Barrueco, n.d.

24. Oral history provided by elderly Macabeos and Jivaro; *Compte*, 1885, p. 26; Vass Galindo, 1895, p. 49; Villavicencio, 1858, pp. 366, 420-21.

25. From oral histories given by elderly Jivaro.

26. E.g. Bullard, 1863.

27. Anonymous, 1952, p. 30. During the 1870's, the population of Macas was estimated to be 300 (Reiss, 1880, p. 329).

28. Vacas Galindo, 1895, pp. 49-50; Anonymous, 1952, p. 38.
29. Karsten, 1935, p. 8.
30. Anonymous, 1952, pp. 32-33; 38.
31. Platt, 1932, pp. 93-94.
32. Most of the following historical information is derived from oral accounts of older Ecuadorian colonists and Jivaro. [173]
33. See Stirling, 1938, Plates 11-17.
34. Dirección General de Estadística y Censos, 1954, pp. 138; 141. These figures include the population of Macas, Méndez, and Gualaquiza, all in the higher western portion of the region. These reports of annual rainfall range from 1,992 mm. at Gualaquiza to 2,599 mm. at Méndez, with the minimum for a single month at any station being 95 mm. Recorded average temperatures from these same stations range from 21.4 to 25.2 degrees Centigrade (Ferdon, 1950, pp. 73-74).
35. Drown, 1961, pp. 22, 31, 58-9, 140-44.
36. Macabeo and Jivaro oral histories. [173]

CHAPTER II

1. Although rainfall is fairly heavy, it is well distributed throughout the year, and the distinct seasonal differences found in much of tropical forest South America are not as evident here. Short term records are available for rainfall and temperature at the Ecuadorian settlements of Macas, Méndez, and Gualaquiza, all in the higher western portion of the region. These reports of annual rainfall range from 1,992 mm. at Gualaquiza to 2,599 mm. at Méndez, with the minimum for a single month at any station being 95 mm. Recorded average temperatures from these same stations range from 21.4 to 25.2 degrees Centigrade (Ferdon, 1950, pp. 73-74). 24
132
2. Cf. Steere, 1950, p. 85.
3. In an earlier paper (Harner, 1962, p. 269) I questioned whether the Jivaro had any gods or goddesses, but additional field study and analysis have led me to be less certain of the classificatory status of Nunui and, in fact, of the definition of "gods" and "goddesses" in general. [128]
4. Demons lack blood. [176]

CHAPTER III

1. Based upon a Summer Institute of Linguistics aerial survey in 1956-57 (Glen Turner, personal communication). The Jivaro population near the Macuma and Yaupi missions, comprising some eighty houses, is specifically excluded in the total here. 361
161
114 •
- The Summer Institute of Linguistics personnel were employing an intentionally conservative estimate of five persons per dwelling, which was used for earlier population estimates by the author (Harner, 1962, p. 259; 1963, p. 9; 1968b, p. 363). Additional research has led the author to revise the estimate of average household population upward to nine, and this is the figure employed in the present study. It seems impossible, however, to reconcile my results with those

• 114
161
361

reported by Danielsson (1949, p. 88) whose Jivaro families, and apparently households, are stated to range from 15 to 46 persons, with an average of approximately 30. Such figures may often occur among the Achuara, who practice permanent matrilineal residence, but Danielsson's study does not deal with that tribe. Two of Danielsson's neighborhoods, Patuca and Yurupaza, were encompassed by the Ecuadorian census of 1950 (Dirección General de Estadística y Censos, 1954, pp. 138, 141) of Jivaro in the Río Upano Valley and included in the aerial count of Jivaro houses by the Summer Institute of Linguistics in 1956-57. A comparison of the SIL Jivaro house count with the census figures for the Jivaro population in the Río Upano Valley, in which both the Patuca and Yurupaza neighborhoods are located, yields an average population of 9.2 persons per dwelling. On these grounds, as well as first-hand observations, it is difficult to accept Danielsson's "family" figures as representative household populations except under unusual circumstances. The few years separating these reports do not seem to be enough to account for this discrepancy and, in fact, informants' enumeration of the composition of earlier "large" households only rarely yielded figures beyond the range of 15 to 20 inhabitants.

000

2. Murdock, 1949, p. 60.

[104]

3. In the Jivaro language *kakaram* and *kakarna* are the same word, their last vowel and consonant being interchangeable, and the precise meaning is clarified by the morphological context. Since the word is being used here out of its linguistic context, *kakarna* is restricted to the designation of "power," and *kakaram* to the designation of "powerful one" in accordance with the observed tendency of use and in order to avoid confusion.

[178]

4. Elderly informants agree that the basic concept and practice of *amigri* trading partners in Jivaro culture antedates ca. 1910, although its intensification and elaboration are recent developments. The investigator failed to find any evidence of a historical connection between the Jivaro *amigri* concept and the Latin American *compadrazgo*. The frontier Jivaro and the Ecuadorians of Macas (the Macabeos) do reciprocally use the term *kumpa* (*compadre*) to address one another, but this is a general term used between any Macabeo and any Jivaro without the implication of personal obligation.

[171]

CHAPTER IV

1. *Arutma* may also be pronounced *arutma*, since the final vowel and consonant are interchangeable, as is the case with many Jivaro words. See Turner (1958) for a discussion of this and some other linguistic aspects of Jivaro.

2. Sollmann, 1957, pp. 381, 394.

3. Castañeda, 1958, and Harner, 1973.

4. One exception is the fireball *arutam*, which only vanishes silently when touched. 000
5. Persons who have seen *arutam* can be surprisingly well singled out by this trait alone. One of the recognized reasons a father helps his son acquire an *arutam* soul is so that a public awareness of his son's supernatural power to avenge will provide protection for the father in case the latter loses his own *arutam* soul(s). [593]
6. There is also a rare super-*arutam*, *ammay*, whose soul is not so easily satisfied and does not leave the body of its possessor when such declarations are made.
7. The *arutam* soul resident in the body of a person is not his own soul in any permanent sense, but only the soul of some ancestral Jivaro dwelling there temporarily.
8. Visitors to the Jivaro are usually impressed by the near shouting which typifies conversations between men of different households and neighborhoods. The functional basis for this custom can be seen in the desire of the individual to advertise his *arutam* power by being forceful in speech and gestures.
9. *Muiské* may alternatively be pronounced *muiska*.
10. When a man does not cut off the head of a person he has murdered (i.e., when the victim belongs to his own tribe), he turns the corpse face down on the ground so that the victim's *muiské* is delayed in emerging through the mouth. Thus the murderer hopes to reach home before the avenging soul can catch him. [766]
11. A rather astonishing amount of misinformation has been published regarding the beliefs surrounding the *tsentsé*. I wish to re-emphasize that any contradictions between the information presented here and previous accounts indicate rejection of that material. [114] •
12. Possibly this is due to the fact that the old clearings provide feeding grounds for these animals.
13. Cf. Der Marderosian et al., 1978.
14. The mythological first shaman.
15. This is a halo of *tsentsé*, analogous to a feather "crown" sometimes worn by *tsikéram*, which is seen as floating over the shaman's head (see Plate 14). [789]
16. The breezes are caused by his *tsentsé* flying around.
17. Particularly on his shoulders.
18. The most powerful shamans (typically of the Candin tribe) known to the Jivaro (see pp. 119-20).

CHAPTER V

1. Davidson (1969, p. 91) mentions a dispute over river fishing rights in the Río Yurupata neighborhood west of the Río Upano, but this is an area in which natural resource scarcity had already developed significantly as a consequence of immigration by white colonists from the province of Azuay. [177]

NOTES

225

- 000
[123] 2. The author has never participated in a war expedition, although he was invited to join one emanating from the Rio Chiquena region against the Achuars in 1977. The description which follows, therefore, is based entirely on informants' accounts.

3. The chant is recorded in Harner, 1971.

- 171
439
177
765
532
727
998
[325] 4. The Jivaro, their Jivaran neighbors, and the Candoshi are the only people within the past few centuries known to make the muma. In addition, the Jivaro claim that the Achuars and the Huastika learned the art from them in fairly recent times and formerly did not cut off heads in war. The Candoshi, in turn, state that they learned the practice fairly recently from the Achuars and Huastika (Wells, 1976, pp. 37-40). During the earlier decades of the present century, the craft was practiced by unscrupulous entrepreneurs using the heads of unclaimed dead in Guayaquil and Panama, which they passed off as Jivaro or mummies (see Karmen, 1955, pp. 8-10; Sterling, 1958, pp. 76-78; and Up de Graff, 1972, footnote, p. 187). Sometimes they went so far as to shrink the skins of native Indians, a practice which, when I described it to Jivaro informants, was greeted with incredulity. The sale of shrunken heads is illegal in Ecuador and only imitations (although sometimes the sellers pretend they are not), made from monkey heads or the skins of other animals, now seem to be marketed.

- 000
[551] 5. Name of the victim. The victim's name is usually learned from captured women or from persons who have interacted with the Achuars in trade.

NOTES

- [321] 1. The appearance of this canoe is well remembered, and in fact informants recalled that in one neighborhood some Jivaro attempted to reach it by building a wooden tower!

- [127] 2. Vaca Galinda, chap. p. 22. Gorgon, 1976, p. 75, and used liberally recorded by the author.

3. *Head Hunters of the Amazon* by F. W. Up de Graff, 1972 (Dodd, Mead and Company).

4. The introduction of a few steel tools to the frontier Jivaro in the vicinity of Mera in the mid-nineteenth century may have increased garden size and production at that time, judging from oral traditions. However, oral information on events as far in the past is not included as evidence in this account of cultural change. A previous version of this article, with comparative data, appeared in Harner, 1976.

NOTES

- [114] 1. I am indebted to Pablo Shukla and Peter Hart for their assistance in abstracting some of the information contained in this section.

MICHAEL J. HARNER is Associate Professor of Anthropology on the Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research in New York. He has taught at various universities including Columbia, Yale, the University of California at Berkeley (where he received his Ph.D.), and has served as Assistant Director of the Robert H. Lowe Museum of Anthropology at Berkeley.

Born in Washington, D.C., in 1929, Dr. Harner spent the earliest years of his childhood in South America. He returned there to do fieldwork among the Jivaro Indians of Ecuador in 1956 and 1957 and the Caniba Indians of Peru in 1960 and 1961. In 1964 and 1969 he pursued additional field studies of the Jivaro and made an expedition to the Jivaron Achuar tribe.

114•